

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 6, 2006, and the references cited therewith. Claims 1-28 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 14 and 19 have been amended to correct minor grammatical errors in the claims. These amendments are being made solely for the purposes of clarifying the claim language, and not in response to any claim objection/rejection presented by the Examiner. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant does not relinquish any range of equivalents for the subject matter presented in these claims. No new matter has been added to the subject application as a result of the changes made thereto.

The Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 8 and 9 is noted, with thanks. However, in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all currently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-7 & 10-28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over OI, et al. (US 2001/0025330 A1) in view of Hackett-Jones, et al. (US 5,651,058). Applicant respectfully submits this rejection is in error.

The Examiner, at pages 2-3 of the Official Action, points to OI as disclosing:

- determining whether a device is connected to a communications port of a messaging system (paragraph 0047);
- receiving a data packet at the communications port (paragraph 0166);
- determining a communications parameter set for the received packet (paragraph 0166);
- analyzing the received packet data structure (paragraph 0166);
- comparing the received packet data structure with a data structure for a known device (paragraph 0167); and
- if the data structure of the packet matches the data structure for the known property management device determining the property management

device coupled to the communications port to be a known device (paragraph 0168).

The Examiner concedes that OI does not teach a property management device (Official Action, Page 3)¹. The Examiner instead relies on Hackett-Jones as providing this teaching.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of OI. To that end, and for the Examiner's convenience, Paragraphs 0166, 0167 and 0168 of the OI reference are reproduced below.

[0166] The self-diagnosis circuit 216 generates a transmission data packet (step S101) and transmits the transmission packet to the data transfer control circuit 241 (step S102). The transmission packet is transferred to the self-diagnosis circuit 216 as a received packet via first and second port circuits 242, 243, the physical layer circuit 244, the link layer circuit 245, the transmission memory 246, and the receipt memory 247 (step S103). *The self-diagnosis circuit 216 analyzes the received packet and compares the data of the transmission packet with the data of the received packet (step S104).* (emphasis added)

[0167] If the transmission packet and the received packet are the same (step S105), the self-diagnosis circuit 216 determines whether the transmission packet is the last packet (step S106). If the last packet has not been received, the self-diagnosis circuit 216 proceeds to step S101. Steps S101 to S106 are repeated until all of the packets are transferred and compared.

[0168] When the last packet is received, the self-diagnosis circuit 216 notifies the MPU 211 that the data transfer control circuit 241 is normal (step S107). If the transmission packet does not match the received packet in step 105, the self-diagnosis circuit 216 notifies the MPU 211 that the data transfer control circuit 241 has an abnormality and of the packet having an error (step S108).

¹ Even though, on the same page of the Official Action, the Examiner states that OI teaches "matches the data structure for the known *property management device*...."

Thus, it is Applicant's understanding that OI teaches comparing a transmitted packet of data with a received packet of the data. If the two data packets are different, the self-diagnosis circuit 216 notifies the MPU of an error.

Applicant respectfully submits there are fundamental differences between the present claims and the teachings of OI. For example, claim 1, as currently amended, requires:

- determining whether a property management device is connected to a communications port of a messaging system;
- receiving a data packet at the communications port;
- determining a communications parameter set for the received packet;
- analyzing the received packet data structure;
- comparing the received packet data structure with a data structure for a known property management device;*** and
- determining if the property management device coupled to the communications port is a known property management device. (emphasis added)

Independent claims 11, 14, 19 and 25 each require similar limitations. Thus, each of Applicant's independent claims requires comparing a received data packet with a data structure for a known property management device. Support for this limitation may be found, for example, at Paragraph 0025 of the present disclosure.

In summary, nowhere does OI disclose or suggest, at least, this limitation. It is not seen how Hackett-Jones provides the missing teaching to OI to achieve or render obvious Applicant's claims. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Hackett-Jones does disclose a property management device, nowhere does Hackett-Jones disclose or suggest comparing a received data packet with a data structure for a known property management device, as required by Applicant's claims.

Furthermore, as the Examiner is well-aware, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art must teach all of the claimed limitations and must provide a motivation for any combination of teachings from multiple references. Here, Applicant respectfully submits that OI cannot be properly combined with Hackett-Jones. A review of both references shows that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the OI and Hackett-Jones references. Moreover, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason to look towards the field of hotel communication when dealing with a circuit that interfaces between a PC and a peripheral device such as a digital video camera, VCR or printer.

In addition, the Examiner relies upon Paragraph [0047] of the OI reference as teaching the step of "determining whether a property management device is connected to a communications port of a messaging system." However, as mentioned above, Applicant believes that OI does not describe a property management system. Moreover, OI does not disclose a "device connected to a communications port of a messaging system." There is no mention of a messaging system in the OI reference.

All of the remaining claims in this rejection depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, 11, 14, 19 or 25, and thus, must be read as incorporating the limitations of the respective independent claims (35 USC § 112, 4th Para.).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7 & 10-28 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over OI, et al. in view of Hackett-Jones, et al. is in error, and should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (603-668-6560) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Colemon

By their Representatives,

Customer Number: 45459

603-668-6560

Date

6-07-06

By

Edmund P. Pfleger
Reg. No. 41,252

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 7th day of June, 2006.

Name

Kyrstin Ryan

Signature

Kyrstin Ryan